

This document has been
approved for release through
the HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM of
the Central Intelligence Agency.

Zapotocky

Date 4 JAN 91

HRP

89-2

I was asked to put in my ~~my~~ two cents worth and am doing so though I can't
see a reason for same in that the comment is done and aint going to be changed
however.....

For internal consumption only and will impale the first man who gets me
in wronger than I am already with the branch.....

I think this comment can be best characterized as ridiculous.
This is a TEMPORARY DOCUMENT
only, for the use of DCI/IS.
The record copy has been
released to National Archives
under the HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM.
The one vital point lies in whether this represents ~~x~~ genuine conversations
Date 4 JAN 91 HRP 89-2

that a genuine Zapotocky had with the "Kremlin." If it does, it's worth very
serious attention no matter how fallacious it may be per se. If it ~~isn't~~ does
not, it doesn't merit any consideration at all (except as an example of the kind
of thing the Kremlin thinks could be usefully planted to fool us.)

CIA throws grave doubt on the authenticity of the conversations. CIA
goes right up to the point of saying flatly that it's a plant. But neither
question is actually answered: it may and may not be authentic and may or may
not be a plant. Yet CIA leaves a very definite impression (with me at least)
that it thinks the whole thing is a phoney from way back. CIA doesn't convince
me that it is phoney; it only makes me believe that that is what it really

Well, having left the impression that the thing is not genuine, the Comment goes on to take it exactly as if it were. Most of the commentary is written from the implied standpoint that we are really talking about something that Stalin actually said to Zapotocky.

All right. This could be done. It would be necessary only to say, in the first place that we do not believe in the authenticity of the report and get that out of the way; then to state that assuming (because we cannot prove definitely that the above is true) that the report is genuine, this is what we ~~think about~~ we should like to say about it.....

If, however, we are going to take the conversations, hypothetically or otherwise, at their face value, there could be no earthly use that I can see in refuting Zapotocky's (or the Kremlin's arguments). It may help improve our self-esteem---as it would a high-school debater's under similar circumstances---to point out that that old Zapotocky is inconsistent and therefore wrong, but it wouldn't help one's understanding of how to evaluate this alleged reflection of Russian thinking. For example, Zapotocky says that "time is on our side", but we say that time is not on their side and show why. The point is completely irrelevant. If the Kremlin thinks that time is on its side, that is important to

Approved For Release 2001/07/27 : CIA-RDP84-00022R000200030016-3

know. Damned important I should think. To know that the Kremlin is wrong about it is also important but not for present purposes. Or again, Zap says that the Kremlin estimates that President Truman is a degenerate mid-Westerner leading a clique motivated by greed and that the country will act accordingly---and we show that Zap and the Kremlin are all wrong about it! Who gives a hoot what we know about Truman et al. Does the Kremlin ^{actually} arrive at this estimate and ^{if so,} isn't it nice ^{that} if it is so fooled.

If refutation of Zapotocky's argument and exposure of the inconsistencies in his conversation serve to further the theory that the report is not authentic, that would be one thing, but it doesn't so far as I can see, isn't intended to, and proba ly couldn't anyway.

Incidentally, if I remember the Zap conversations as a whole---which I have only read once and then quickly, there are some pretty sharp observations on ~~ESZMS~~ actual Western weaknesses and Soviet strengths. If this is true, I should think it would be pretty foolish to ignore them and pass the whole thing off as just an extension of normal Soviet propaganda about its invincibility. In short, on the genuine hypothesis, I seem to remember that there are supporting points which ought to be ~~printed~~ reckoned with and given their just due. As

probably phoney statement which even if true only shows that the Soviets don't know what they're talking about. (Incidentally, even the CIA comment concedes that the Kremlin receives "tailored" intelligence, indicating that it may well be convinced of what we know is false but have some other keen perceptions, all leading up to a view that the report may be quite genuine.)

All right, now tell me that there was a request for this comment that specified ~~they should~~ it should specialize in refutation. See if I care.